

cause in the United States and abroad. The Order is designed to deny these traffickers the benefit of any assets subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and to prevent United States persons from engaging in any commercial dealings with them, their front companies, and their agents. Executive Order No. 12978 demonstrates the U.S. commitment to end the scourge that such traffickers have wrought upon society in the United States and beyond.

The magnitude and the dimension of the problem in Colombia—perhaps the most pivotal country of all in terms of the world's cocaine trade—is extremely grave. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against significant foreign narcotics traffickers and their violent and corrupting activities as long as these measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 23, 1996.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### CLOSING A PROFITABLE PLANT MAY LEAD TO A CHANGE IN THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this is a speech I was hoping I would not have to give. It is a speech I may have to repeat at greater length, and I hope I will not have to do that.

In the City of New Bedford, which I represent, there is a plant, the J.C. Rhodes Co., which has been for a very long time a successful manufacturing plant, manufacturing metal fasteners, manufacturing some basic devices, and they have been profitable. We have heard a lot about American industry not being able to compete. Well, we have a plant here with an excellent dedicated work force. This plant has been around 100 years, and it is successful and profitable.

Recently the plant was bought, not by another primary metal producer, but by a financial organization. This financial organization then decided that it would shut down this profitable plant because they could make more

money by shutting the plant down and consolidating the production at a plant in a different part of the country. They did not argue that it was a problem of lack of profitability. They did not argue there was no way they could make a go of it in Massachusetts. They did not argue it was because our costs were too high.

Mr. Speaker, it was simply that because of the financial manipulations involved they now found it more profitable to shut down the plant. No one is asking them to lose money.

I have not gotten into detail about the names of individuals; I hope there will not be a need to do that, because I do not want to interfere with negotiations going on now. But it would be a failure on my part not to make clear to all concerned what the stakes are.

The stakes are these. We have a profitable plant in a part of the country where industry has, for a variety of reasons, been diminishing. Heavy industry. This plant is still profitable. It was bought. We have responsible, successful business people, themselves in the manufacturing business, working with the city government and the city of New Bedford, working with the union, the United Electrical Union, working with others, and they are ready to buy the plant at a reasonable price and keep it going. We are being told that we cannot have that, by some, not because this plant is not profitable but because, to be honest, some extremely wealthy people can add incrementally to their great wealth by throwing these people out of work.

That is why this is so important. The question that America has to confront right now is, are we at a point in our economic system, with the rules that have been set forth legally and in every other way, in which the jobs of the 100 people and of families dependent on them count for zero; in which the fact these people have been working very hard for many years profitably for their employer counts for zero; in which the great costs that would be imposed on the city of New Bedford and the surrounding area, the city of Fall River and surrounding areas where these people work, does that count for zero solely so that some people who are already quite wealthy can become a little bit wealthier?

They can increase wealth that will make no difference in their lives except when they chortle over the balance sheets.

I am not asking anyone to take a loss or to keep open a building or a plant that cannot make it. I am saying that, if we are going to be told that the rules are such that this financial conglomerate can come in and simply buy up a plant and shut it down and throw these people out of work and have no concern for the disastrous financial consequences, no concern for the tax losses, no concern for the unemployment compensation that will be paid out, for the mortgage loans that will be

defaulted, the student loans that will not be paid back; if the system allows a small number of people to get a little wealthier by causing this degree of financial havoc when the plant can make it on their own and people are willing to buy it and keep it running at a price that would be a reasonable price, then the rules have to be changed.

Mr. Speaker, I have met with the owners of the plant, along with business people from my district, along with the union and people from the mayor's office working with our Senators, Senators KENNEDY and KERRY. We are trying to persuade the owners to be reasonable, not to take a loss, not to subsidize anybody, but to tell us that the lives of these working people do not count for zero, that a marginal increment in their great wealth is not going to be the only factor. If in the end their answer is that nothing else counts in the balance, that nothing but their ability to maximize their already high profits will count, that all of the serious real economic costs that will be imposed on working people and on the city and on the State of Massachusetts, that those will count for nothing, then they are helping to convince me we have to change the rules.

□ 1815

I want the free market system to work. I do not want to interfere with it. But I cannot as a Representative sit idly by and allow the system to go forward if the consequence is that extraordinarily decent hard-working people are penalized and victimized solely for the financial gain of a small number of people with no real economic improvement for society. I hope I will not have to again be at this microphone on this subject.

#### EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to address my colleagues in the House on the subject of education. Everywhere you turn, in fact I just read this recent article in U.S. News and World Report, there is criticism about United States education. This U.S. News and World Report article and cover story is entitled Dumb and Dumber. It talks about the failure of the United States education.

Part of the debate here before Congress has been the question of how much money we throw at different programs. One of the questions I have always raised is, are we paying more and getting less?

One of the criticisms of the new Republican majority is that they were cutting "education." In fact, that really is not the case. If you just took a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, to look at the initial budget that we proposed for the House of Representatives and